

Remarks

I. Introduction

This is in response to the Office Action dated February 22, 2010.

The Office Action rejected claims 13 and 22 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,601,679 to Crenella et al. ("Crenella") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0183008 to Menard et al ("Menard").

Claims 14-21, 23-27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Crenella in view of Menard and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,416 to Robert Myer ("Myer").

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard, and in further view of Myer and U.S. Patent No. 6,209,480 to Mehrdad Moslehi ("Moslehi").

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard, and in futher view of Myer and U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0024460 to Ghosh et al. ("Ghosh").

In response, Applicant presents the remarks below. Claims 1-12 were previously cancelled. Claims 13-33 remain for consideration.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard.

In order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382,

1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). See also MPEP § 2143.03. The cited references, separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claim 13. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The present invention relates to a device for remote reading of states comprising a communication network and a plurality of peripherals, each of which adopts an instantaneous state. The device also includes a controller periodically scanning the peripherals to read the instantaneous state of the peripherals. The communication network electromagnetically connects the peripherals to the controller, and the peripherals are supplied with electrical energy via the communication network. The invention is useful for managing calls in elevators by means of peripherals not provided with any galvanic connection or individual power source, and thereby provides significant advantages by reducing the cost and complexity of providing an elevator installation.

Independent claim 13 includes the limitation of “each peripheral device adopting at each instant an instantaneous status belonging to a plurality of possible statuses, the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses.” Crenella and Menard, separately or in combination, do not disclose these limitations.

Crenella pertains to a two-part wireless communications system for elevator hallway fixtures in which elevator system hall fixtures are connected to a controller via wireless transceivers. Although Crenella column 2, lines 28-29 describe a spread-spectrum communication system performing control functions using RF communications, the cited section does not describe hall fixtures or other peripheral devices adopting an instantaneous status. Further, no other section of Crenella describes hall fixtures or other peripheral devices adopting an instantaneous status. As such, Crenella does not disclose “each peripheral device adopting at each instant an instantaneous status belonging to a plurality of possible statuses” as recited in claim 13.

The Office Action does not indicate that Menard provides the limitation missing from Crenella, further, Menard does not provide the limitation missing from Crenella.

Menard pertains to a power door control and sensor module for a wireless system in which a module with a sensor to indicate the position of a door is coupled to a door opener. Although Menard indicates that the module provides information to a user over a wireless communication channel, Menard does not describe the module as adopting an instantaneous status. As such, Menard does not disclose “each peripheral device adopting at each instant an instantaneous status belonging to a plurality of possible statuses” as recited in claim 13.

Also, Crenella and Menard, separately or in combination, do not disclose the limitation of “the controller being operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses” as recited in claim 13. The Office Action admits that Crenella does not explicitly disclose this limitation but states that Menard provides the limitation missing from Crenella in Menard paragraphs [0041] and [0073]. Although Menard paragraph [0041] mentions ad hock networking, automatic detection of transceivers, and periodic monitoring of radio frequencies, Menard paragraph [0041] does not disclose periodically scanning peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses. Menard paragraph [0073] discusses using the invention of Menard in garage door openers and for various other openers and actuators but does not describe periodically scanning devices to read their instantaneous statuses. Further, no section of Menard discloses periodically scanning devices to read their instantaneous statuses. As such, Menard does not provide the limitation missing from Crenella.

For reasons discussed above Crenella and Menard, separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 13. As such, the cited references do not render claim 13 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenella in view of Menard.

For the reasons discussed above, sole independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited art. Allowance of independent claim 13 is requested.

All remaining dependent claims are dependent upon an allowable independent claim and are therefore also allowable.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, all pending claims are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If this communication is filed after the shortened statutory time period has elapsed and no separate Petition is enclosed (or the enclosed Petition is insufficient), the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is petitioned, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), to extend the time for filing a response to the outstanding Office Action by the number of months which will avoid abandonment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.135. The fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 should be charged to our Deposit Account No. 06-2143.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph G. Fenske/

Joseph G. Fenske
Reg. No. 54,592
Tel.: 973-530-2128

Date: June 22, 2010
Wolff & Samson PC
One Boland Drive
West Orange, NJ 07052